arXiv:1405.7067v1 [math.ST] 27 May 2014

Explicit Form of Coefficients in any MA(2) Process

Simon Ku and Eugene Seneta*

School of Mathematics and Statistics FO7, University of Sydney, N.S.W. 2006, Australia

May 29, 2014

Abstract

We shall show that for *any* $MA(2)$ process (apart from those with coefficients θ_1, θ_2 lying on certain line-segments) there is *one and only one invertible* $MA(2)$ process with the *same* autocovariances $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$. It is this invertible version which computer-packages fit, regardless, even if data came from a non-invertible $MA(2)$ process. This has consequences for prediction from a fitted process, inasmuch as such prediction would seem to be inappropriate. We express the coefficients θ_1, θ_2 of the invertible version in terms of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ explicitly using analytical reasoning, following a graphical approach of Sbrana (2012) which indicates this result within the invertibility region. We also express (θ_1, θ_2) in the non-invertibility region.

1 $MA(2)$ Review

Suppose we know that we are dealing with an $MA(2)$ process:

$$X(t) = e(t) - \theta_1 e(t-1) - \theta_2 e(t-2)$$

where $\sigma^2 = Var(e(t))$, where $\{e(t)\}$ is white noise, $\theta_2 \neq 0$, and whose non-zero autocovariances $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ are specified.

*Corresponding author. Email address: eseneta@maths.usyd.edu.au (Eugene Seneta).

The ACF of $X(t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_0} &= \rho_1 = \frac{-\theta_1 + \theta_1\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2} \\ \frac{\gamma_2}{\gamma_0} &= \rho_2 = \frac{-\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2} \\ \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma_0} &= \frac{1}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Write

$$M(z) = z^2 - \theta_1 z - \theta_2. \tag{2}$$

The $MA(2)$ process is *invertible* if and only if the roots z_1, z_2 (which are $\neq 0$ since $\theta_2 \neq 0$) of

$$M(z) = 0 \tag{3}$$

satisfy $|z_i| < 1, i = 1, 2$.

Equivalently, the invertibility conditions of $X(t)$, that is the region of (θ_1, θ_2) in $\mathbf{R^2}$ which is commonly referred to as invertible triangle for $MA(2)$, are

$$\theta_2 - \theta_1 < 1 \tag{4}$$

$$\theta_2 + \theta_1 < 1 \tag{5}$$

$$\theta_2^2 < 1. \tag{6}$$

These can also be described as:

$$|1 - \theta_2| > |\theta_1| \tag{7}$$

$$|\theta_2| < 1. \tag{8}$$

In terms of γ_1, γ_2, and σ^2, θ_1, and θ_2 can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 &= -\frac{\gamma_1}{\sigma^2+\gamma_2} \\ \theta_2 &= -\frac{\gamma_2}{\sigma^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Give $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, the correct expression of (θ_1, θ_2) depends on the correct choice of σ^2.

Substituting from (9) in the definition of σ^2 in (1), we have

$$x^4 + a_1 x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_1 k x + k^2 = 0 \tag{10}$$

where $x = \sigma^2$ and $a_1 = 2\gamma_2 - \gamma_0$, $a_2 = 2\gamma_2^2 - 2\gamma_0\gamma_2 + \gamma_1^2$, $k = \gamma_2^2$, $a_3 = a_1 k$, $a_4 = k^2$.

Sbrana (2011) (2012) asserts that there is only one solution of (10), which he expresses explicitly in terms of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, which gives (θ_1, θ_2) in (9) corresponding to an invertible process (that is: satisfying (4)-(6)). His reasoning is graphical (Sbrana, 2012), based on scanning Figure 3 of Stralkowski *et al.* (1974), which is Chart C, p.663 of Box *et al.* (2008).

One motivation for the present paper is to verify this analytically.

We shall first show that, for *any* $MA(2)$ process, apart from those with (θ_1, θ_2) satisfying one of (a)-(c) below, there is *one and only one invertible* $MA(2)$ process with the *same* $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

It is this invertible version which computer-packages fit, regardless, even if data came from a non-invertible $MA(2)$ process. This has consequences for prediction from a fitted process, inasmuch as such prediction would seem to be inappropriate.

We shall express $\theta_1, \theta_2, \sigma^2$ explicitly in terms of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, for any $MA(2)$ process with an invertible version, irrespective of whether invertibility holds or not.

The (a)-(c) below correspond to there being a root of (2) on the unit circle: (a) a root 1, (b) a root -1, and (c) a (complex) root $e^{i\lambda}, \lambda \neq 0, -\pi < \lambda < \pi$:

(a) $1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2 = 0$.

(b) $1 + \theta_1 - \theta_2 = 0$.

(c) $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (2cos\lambda, -1), \lambda \neq 0, -\pi < \lambda < \pi$.

Note that (a)-(c) together contain the *boundaries* of the invertibility triangle, the open set described by (4)-(6).

2 Anderson's Identity: Consequences

Given an $MA(2)$ process with coefficients $\theta_1, \theta_2 \neq 0, \sigma^2$, and autocovariances $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, a relationship between the two triples is given by Anderson's Identity (Anderson, 1971, Lemma 3.4.1):

$$\sum_{h=-2}^{2} \gamma_h z^h = \sigma^2 M(z) M(z^{-1}) \tag{11}$$

where $M(\cdot)$ is defined by (2).

We now adapt to our specific situation the sketch-argument of Anderson (1971, Section 5.7). We were motivated by remarks in the paper of Teräsvirta (1977), within a more general setting.

The two roots of (3), z_1, z_2, are both non-zero, real, or are a complex conjugate pair. We may write:

$$M(z)M(z^{-1}) = (z - z_1)(z - z_2)(z^{-1} - z_1)(z^{-1} - z_2)$$

so z_1^{-1}, z_2^{-1} are the roots of $M(z^{-1}) = 0$.

Hence both z_i and z_i^{-1} are roots of

$$\sum_{h=-2}^{2} \gamma_h z^h = 0 \tag{12}$$

from (11). If $|z_i| \neq 1, i = 1, 2$, then one of the roots z_i, z_i^{-1}, for each fixed i, has absolute value *less than 1.* Hence the four roots of (12) can be grouped into two sets $(w_1, w_2), (w_3, w_4)$, where $|w_i| < 1, i = 1, 2$, and $|w_i| > 1, i = 3, 4$. Now define

$$M^*(z) = (z - w_1)(z - w_2).$$

Then (11) holds, with $M(z)$ on the right-hand side replaced by $M^*(z)$ and σ^2 replaced by

$$(\sigma^*)^2 = \sum_{h=-2}^{2} \gamma_h / (M^*(1))^2.$$

Thus if $|z_i| \neq 1, i = 1, 2$, that is: if there is no unit modulus root of $M(z) = 0$, then there is an *invertible* $MA(2)$ process with these specified $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

Pursuing the case $|z_i| \neq 1, i = 1, 2$ further, we see that if z_1 is *real* and if $z_1 \neq z_2$, there are *four distinct* $MA(2)$ processes with these same specified $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$. These are defined by taking $M^*(z) = (z - v_1)(z - v_2)$, where $(v_1, v_2) \in \{(z_1, z_2), (z_1, z_2^{-1}), (z_2, z_1^{-1}), (z_1^{-1}, z_2^{-1})\}$, with corresponding coefficients

$$(\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*) = (v_1 + v_2, -v_1 v_2).$$

Note that we may not choose $(v_1, v_2) = (z_i, z_i^{-1})$ to define $M^*(z)$, since then $M^*(z)M^*(z^{-1})$ would not involve $z_j, j \neq i$ at all, so (2) would not hold.

Next, if $|z_i| \neq 1, i = 1, 2$ if z_1 is *real* and if $z_1 = z_2$, the above argument shows that there will be *just two distinct* $MA(2)$ processes with these same specified $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

If z_1 is *complex*, and $|z_i| \neq 1, i = 1, 2$, then z_1, z_2 are complex conjugates, and there are *just two* $MA(2)$ processes each of form with $v_1 = a^* e^{i\lambda^*}, \lambda^* \neq 0, a^* = |v_1| \neq 1, v_2 = a^* e^{-i\lambda^*}$. The coefficients are, for each, of form:

$$(\theta_1^*, \theta_2^*) = (v_1 + v_2, -v_1 v_2) = (2a^* \cos \lambda^*, -(a^*)^2).$$

Finally, if $|z_i| = 1$ for at least one of $i = 1, 2$, each of the possible choices of the pair (v_1, v_2) to form $MA(2)$ processes with the prespecified $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, will have $|v_i| = 1$ for at least one of $i = 1, 2$. Thus none of these processes will be invertible, and the coefficients (θ_1, θ_2) of each are described by one of (a)-(c) above. In particular, *there is no invertible version* if $|z_i| = 1$ for at least one of $i = 1, 2$.

3 Explicit Forms

In this section we develop general theory, given any $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ for some $MA(2)$ process to express θ_1, θ_2 in terms of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

Divided by x^2, the quartic equation (10) is reduced to a quadratic equation in terms of z, where $z = x + \frac{k}{x}$,

$$z^2 + a_1 z + (a_2 - 2k) = 0, \tag{13}$$

whence the roots of (13) are

$$z_- = \frac{1}{2}(-a_1 - G) = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0 - 2\gamma_2 - G) \tag{14}$$

$$z_+ = \frac{1}{2}(-a_1 + G) = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0 - 2\gamma_2 + G) \tag{15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \sqrt{a_1^2 - 4(a_2 - 2k)} \\ &= \sqrt{(2\gamma_2 - \gamma_0)^2 - 4(\gamma_1^2 - 2\gamma_0\gamma_2)} \\ &= \sqrt{4\gamma_2^2 + 4\gamma_0\gamma_2 + \gamma_0^2 - 4\gamma_1^2} \\ &= \sqrt{(\gamma_0 - 2\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2)(\gamma_0 + 2\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2)} \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sqrt{(\gamma_0 - \frac{2(-\theta_1+\theta_1\theta_2)}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0 + 2\frac{-\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0)} \times \\
&\quad \sqrt{(\gamma_0 + \frac{2(-\theta_1+\theta_1\theta_2)}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0 + 2\frac{-\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0)} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\sqrt{(1-\theta_2+\theta_1)^2(1-\theta_2-\theta_1)^2} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}|(1-\theta_2+\theta_1)(1-\theta_2-\theta_1)| \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}|(1-\theta_2)^2-\theta_1^2|. \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that G^2 is the discriminant of quadratic equation (13), $G \geq 0$, and has been expressed in terms of γ_i, as well as in terms of θ_i.

From $z = x + \frac{k}{x}$, we have

$$x^2 - zx + k = 0. \qquad (17)$$

Because z can be taken z_- or z_+, x then can be four possible solutions, namely

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(z_- - H_-) \qquad (18)\\
x_2 &= \frac{1}{2}(z_- + H_-) \qquad (19)\\
x_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(z_+ - H_+) \qquad (20)\\
x_4 &= \frac{1}{2}(z_+ + H_+). \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $x_1x_2 = x_3x_4 = k$, a property of a quadratic equation of (17). H_-^2, H_+^2 is the discriminant of this quadratic equation in the respective cases $z = z_-, z_+$. Again, we shall show that H_-, H_+ can be expressed in terms of the γ_i as well as the θ_i.

In general, given $x_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, four sets of (θ_1, θ_2) can be defined as follows.

Taking x_1 as σ^2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\theta_1 &= -\frac{4\gamma_1}{\gamma_0 + 2\gamma_2 - G - 2H_-} \\
\theta_2 &= -\frac{4\gamma_2}{\gamma_0 - 2\gamma_2 - G - 2H_-}. \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking x_2 as σ^2,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 &= -\frac{4\gamma_1}{\gamma_0+2\gamma_2-G+2H_-}\\ \theta_2 &= -\frac{4\gamma_2}{\gamma_0-2\gamma_2-G+2H_-}.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Taking x_3 as σ^2,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 &= -\frac{4\gamma_1}{\gamma_0+2\gamma_2+G-2H_+}\\ \theta_2 &= -\frac{4\gamma_2}{\gamma_0-2\gamma_2+G-2H_+}.\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Taking x_4 as σ^2,

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1 &= -\frac{4\gamma_1}{\gamma_0+2\gamma_2+G+2H_+}\\ \theta_2 &= -\frac{4\gamma_2}{\gamma_0-2\gamma_2+G+2H_+}.\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

If $|1-\theta_2|>|\theta_1|$, that is for every (θ_1,θ_2), *satisfying first two of invertibility conditions* (4)-(5), then $G=\frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}((1-\theta_2)^2-\theta_1^2)$.

In terms of θ_1,θ_2, under $|1-\theta_2|>|\theta_1|$, from (14)-(15),

$$\begin{aligned}z_- &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0-2\frac{-\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0-\frac{(1-\theta_2)^2-\theta_1^2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0)\\ &= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(2\theta_2+\theta_1^2)\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}z_+ &= \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0-2\frac{-\theta_2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0+\frac{(1-\theta_2)^2-\theta_1^2}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\gamma_0)\\ &= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(1+\theta_2^2)\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}H_- &= \sqrt{z_-^2-4k}=\sqrt{z_-^2-4\gamma_2^2}\\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_0^2}{(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)^2}(2\theta_2+\theta_1^2)^2-4\frac{\theta_2^2\gamma_0^2}{(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)^2}}\\ &= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\sqrt{\theta_1^2(\theta_1^2+4\theta_2)}\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_+ &= \sqrt{z_+^2 - 4k} = \sqrt{z_+^2 - 4\gamma_2^2} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_0^2}{(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)^2}(1+\theta_2^2)^2 - 4\frac{\theta_2^2\gamma_0^2}{(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)^2}} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\sqrt{(1-\theta_2^2)^2} \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}|1-\theta_2^2|. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}
$$

In view of (2), when the discriminant of the characteristic equation $I - \theta_1 B - \theta_2 B^2 = 0$ of $MA(2)$ satisfies:

$$\theta_1^2 + 4\theta_2 \geq 0 \qquad (30)$$

then both H_- of (28) and H_+ of (29) are real, and there are four real solutions, otherwise there are only two real solutions for σ^2.

If $|1-\theta_2| \leq |\theta_1|$, then $G = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(\theta_1^2 - (1-\theta_2)^2)$, and from (26)-(27), $z_- = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(1+\theta_2^2)$ and $z_+ = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(2\theta_2+\theta_1^2)$. Hence $H_- = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}|1-\theta_2^2|$, $H_+ = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\sqrt{\theta_1^2(\theta_1^2+4\theta_2)}$. Furthermore, when $|\theta_2| < 1$ then $H_- = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(1-\theta_2^2)$, otherwise $H_- = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}(\theta_2^2-1)$ when $|\theta_2| \geq 1$.

4 Invertible $MA(2)$

Suppose the process is known to invertible, so (4)-(6) all hold, and additionally that (30) holds. Then (since $\theta_2 \neq 0$) $x_i, i = 1,2,3,4$ are all positive:

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_1 &= \frac{\gamma_0}{2(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)}(2\theta_2+\theta_1^2 - \sqrt{\theta_1^2(\theta_1^2+4\theta_2)}) \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}} - \sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}+\theta_2}\right)^2 \\
&> 0 \qquad (31) \\
x_2 &= \frac{\gamma_0}{2(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)}(2\theta_2+\theta_1^2 + \sqrt{\theta_1^2(\theta_1^2+4\theta_2)}) \\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}} + \sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}+\theta_2}\right)^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& > 0 && (32)\\
x_3 &= \frac{\gamma_0}{2(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)}(1+\theta_2^2-1+\theta_2^2)\\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\theta_2^2\\
& > 0 && (33)\\
x_4 &= \frac{\gamma_0}{2(1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2)}(1+\theta_2^2+1-\theta_2^2)\\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\\
& > 0. && (34)
\end{aligned}
$$

Under the invertibility conditions alone (i.e. irrespective of whether (30) holds) we see from the above that $0 < x_3 < x_4$*, and* $x_4 = \sigma^2$ *is the only correct solution.*

If and only if additionally (30) holds, x_1 and x_2 are both real, and, in the event clearly $0 < x_1 \leq x_2$. The inequality is strict if the inequality in (30) is strict, as we shall assume for the rest of this section and (for convenience) §5.

In fact then $x_4 = \max(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$, $x_3 = \min(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ and $x_3 < x_1 < x_2 < x_4$. Since $\theta_2 < 1 + \theta_1$, $\theta_2 < 1 - \theta_1$, therefore $\theta_2 < 1 - |\theta_1| = 1 - 2\frac{|\theta_1|}{2}$. This leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_2 &= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}+\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}+\theta_2}\right)^2\\
&< \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}+\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}+(1-2|\frac{\theta_1}{2}|)}\right)^2\\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}+\sqrt{(1-|\frac{\theta_1}{2}|)^2}\right)^2\\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(|\frac{\theta_1}{2}|+1-|\frac{\theta_1}{2}|\right)^2\\
&= x_4
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
x_1 = \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}-\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}+\theta_2}\right)^2
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&> \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}-(\sqrt{\frac{\theta_1^2}{4}}+\sqrt{|\theta_2|})\right)^2\\
&= \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}|\theta_2|\\
&> \frac{\gamma_0}{1+\theta_1^2+\theta_2^2}\theta_2^2\\
&= x_3
\end{aligned}
$$

as $|\theta_2|<1$. Here inequality of $\sqrt{a+b}<\sqrt{a}+\sqrt{|b|}$, if $a>0$, is used.

The ranking $x_3<x_1<x_2<x_4$ is, naturally, consistent with $x_1x_2=x_3x_4=k$. Thus if x_4 is the largest of the four positive numbers, x_3 must be the smallest by this identity, and x_1,x_2 must be in between them in size. This order holds for *any* $MA(2)$ processes (invertible or non-invertible).

In terms of $\gamma_0,\gamma_1,\gamma_2$ of an *invertible* $MA(2)$ process, (θ_1,θ_2) (without explicit involvement of $\sigma^2=x_4$ and irrespective of whether (30) holds or not) is therefore defined by (25), where G,H_+ are also functions of $\gamma_i, i=0,1,2$. That is to say (θ_1,θ_2) constructed as above via $\sigma^2=x_4$ lie *always* in the invertible triangle.

5 Identification of σ^2

Given $\gamma_0,\gamma_1,\gamma_2$,$x_i, i=1,2,3,4$ are defined by the general expressions (18)-(21). Label (4)-(6) as $(A),(B),(C)$.

If an $MA(2)$ process has an invertible version, then, according to our §2 there are eight cases for the pair (θ_1,θ_2) which need to be checked to see for each case when σ^2 is calculated correctly. In the case of invertibility, as we have seen the correct σ^2 is the maximum in magnitude (that is, of rank 4) of four possibilities $x_i, i=1,2,3,4$, as in (31)-(34), if all four are real (and positive). But in other cases, the size of correct σ^2 in magnitude can be of rank 1, 2, or 3.

By the superscript c we shall mean the *strict* reverse inequality. Thus while A means $\theta_2-\theta_1<1$, A^c will mean $\theta_2-\theta_1>1$. We then have the following eight cases:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Case(1) &= ABC\\
Case(2) &= A^cBC\\
Case(3) &= AB^cC
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
Case(4) &= A^cB^cC \\
Case(5) &= ABC^c \\
Case(6) &= A^cBC^c \\
Case(7) &= A^cB^cC^c \\
Case(8) &= AB^cC^c
\end{aligned} \tag{35}
$$

Note that Case(4) is impossible. If D is defined to be (30) with strict inequality, then Case(1) and Case(5) can each be split, into Case(1a) and Case(5a), that is $ABCD$ and ABC^cD respectively; and Case(1b) and Case(5b), that is $ABCD^c$ and ABC^cD^c respectively. Only Case(1) and Case(5) may be so split, of the possible seven cases. For the other five possible cases, D must hold automatically.

The order of $0 < x_3 < x_1 < x_2 < x_4$ (or $0 < x_3 < x_4$, if only x_3, x_4 are real) holds even in the cases other than invertibility.

Only two real solutions x_3, x_4 for σ^2 are obtained when D^c holds.

Individual algebraic consideration of the above cases via $x_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, gives the correct σ^2 as: in Case(1a), x_4, the largest of four; in Case(1b), x_4, the largest of two (x_3, x_4); in Case(2), x_2, the second largest of four; in Case(3), x_2, the second largest of four; in Case(5a), x_3, the smallest of four; in Case(5b), x_3, the smallest of two (x_3, x_4); in Case(6), x_1, the third largest of four; in Case(7), x_3, the smallest of four; in Case(8), x_1, the third largest of four.

Thus, given $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$, and a case number for (θ_1, θ_2), there are multiple candidates for x_i, but only one is "correct" for σ^2.

We can actually simplify: only four situations are needed to classify all cases based on the constraints of (θ_1, θ_2) in view of (7)-(8).

If $|1 - \theta_2| > |\theta_1|, |\theta_2| < 1$, i.e. Case(1), that is Case(1a) and Case(1b), then use x_4 as the correct σ^2, the largest of x_i.

If $|1 - \theta_2| > |\theta_1|, |\theta_2| \geq 1$, i.e. Case(5), that is Case(5a) and Case(5b), or Case(7), then use x_3 as the correct σ^2, the smallest of x_i (the sign of H_+ in z_+ exchanged, so the correct σ^2 changes from x_4 (in Case(1)) to x_3).

If $|1-\theta_2| < |\theta_1|, |\theta_2| < 1$, i.e. Case(2) or Case(3), then use x_2 as the correct σ^2, the second largest of x_i (the sign of H_- in z_- exchanged, hence z_-, z_+ exchanged, so the correct σ^2 changes from x_4 (in Case(1)) to x_2).

If $|1 - \theta_2| < |\theta_1|, |\theta_2| > 1$, i.e. Case(6) or Case(8), then use x_1 as the correct σ^2, the third largest of x_i (the sign of H_+ in z_+, and H_- in z_- both exchanged, so the correct σ^2 changes from x_4 (in Case(1)) to x_1).

We mention an especially interesting case of a non-invertible $MA(2)$ process which has an invertible version as indeed foreshadowed in our §2: $\theta_2 = -1, |\theta_1| > 2$. In this situation $H_- = 0$, and $x_1 = x_2$ is the "correct" σ^2, and $x_3 < x_1 = x_2 < x_4$.

We see from the above that in any *non-invertible* case for which there is an invertible version, the largest x_i, namely x_4, is *never* the "correct" σ^2.

For any such case, now choose an $x_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ which is not the "correct" x_i for the process, put it equal to σ^2 and construct (θ_1, θ_2) via (9). If the resulting process were invertible, the "correct" σ^2 would be x_4, by our §4, a contradiction to our choice of x_i.

We know that there is an invertible version from our §2, so, by elimination of x_1, x_2, x_3, it must correspond to x_4. Now put $x_4 = \sigma^2$ and construct (θ_1, θ_2) via (9), to give the invertible version of the given $MA(2)$ process with the same $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$.

6 Conclusions

1. For the first time all solutions $x = \sigma^2$ of the quartic equation (10) are considered, and each of them represents an $MA(2)$ invertible or non-invertible process, explicitly in terms of (θ_1, θ_2) by (22)-(25).
2. Given $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ corresponding to some $MA(2)$ process, there are either two or four $MA(2)$ processes with these autocovariances, precisely one of which is invertible.
3. Given $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ corresponding to some $MA(2)$ process, the unique invertible $MA(2)$ process with this autocovariance structure has $\sigma^2 = x_4$, where x_4 is explicitly given in terms of $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ by (21), and the corresponding (θ_1, θ_2) by (25).
4. Given $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ corresponding to some $MA(2)$ process, providing, in addition, we know to which of the above seven possible cases in (35) it corresponds, all of $\sigma^2, \theta_1, \theta_2$ can be explicitly specified and uniquely determined.

7 Acknowledgement

We thank Giacomo Sbrana for correspondence (24 October-13 November, 2012) relating to the papers Sbrana (2011) (2012). Our work on

related topics began with Ku and Seneta (1998).

References

[1] T.W. Anderson (1971) *The Statistical Analysis of Time Series.* Wiley, New York.

[2] G.E.P. Box, G.M. Jenkins, and G.C. Reinsel (2008) *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control.* Wiley, Hoboken,N.J.

[3] S. Ku and E. Seneta (1998) "Practical estimation from the sum of $AR(1)$ processes. " *Commun. Statist.-Simulation and Computation*, 27, 981-998.

[4] G. Sbrana (2011) "Structural time series models and aggregation: some analytical results." *J. Time. Ser. Anal.*, 32, 315-316.

[5] G. Sbrana (2012) "Forecasting aggregated moving average processes with an application to the Euro area real interest rate." *J. Forecast.*, 31, 85-98.

[6] C.M. Stralkowski, S.M. Wu and R.E. DeVor (1974) "Charts for the interpretation and estimation of the second order moving average and mixed first order autoregressive-moving average models." *Technometrics*, 16, 275-285.

[7] T. Teräsvirta, (1977) "The invertability of sums of discrete MA and $ARMA$ processes." *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 4, 165-170.